



**Pacific Electric (PE) ROW/West Santa Ana Branch Corridor
Alternatives Analysis
Steering Committee Meeting #4
Working Session**

Friday, February 25, 2011
3:00 – 4:30 PM

City of South Gate Civic Center/Main Hall
8680 California Avenue
South Gate, CA 90280

Meeting Summary

Attendees	Organization
Hon. Diane DuBois	Metro
Hon. Scott Larsen	Bellflower
Hon. Bruce Barrows	Cerritos
Hon. Frank Gurule	Cudahy
Shannon DeLong	Downey
Hon. William Dalton	Garden Grove
Hon. Andy Molina	Huntington Park
Hon. Ed Varela	Maywood
Hon. Michelle Martinez	Santa Ana
Hon. Maria Davila	South Gate
Hon. Gil Hurtado	South Gate
Hon. Carol Warren	Stanton
Christy Delp	Orange County Supervisorial District 1
Mary Nguyen	FTA
Philip Law	SCAG
Rich Macias	SCAG
Steve Fox	SCAG
Renee Berlin	Metro
Jon Grace	Metro
Alan Patashnick	Metro
Karen Heit	Gateway Cities COG
Jerry Wood	Gateway Cities COG
Mike Kodama	OLDA
Bob Huddy	OLDA
Wendy Garcia	OCTA
Marissa Espino	OCTA
David Sanchez	Anaheim
Deborah Chankin	Bellflower
Keith Jones	Garden Grove

Douglas D. Dumhart	La Palma
Raul Godinez	Santa Ana
Alvie Betancourt	South Gate
Kevin Wilson	Vernon
Nancy Michali	AECOM
Yara Jasso	AECOM
Joel Ulloa	AECOM
Katherine Padilla	Katherine Padilla & Associates

Welcome and Introductions

Metro Director Diane DuBois, Steering Committee Co-Chair, opened the meeting and welcomed committee members. After self-introductions of attendees, P. Law reviewed the purpose of the working session. He stated that its purpose was to:

- 1) Prepare the Committee members to make a milestone decision at the next Steering Committee Meeting (on April 27, 2011) regarding which two of the Initial Set of Alternatives should move forward into the Final Screening phase for more detailed evaluation, and
- 2) Review the AA process and the work performed-to-date that led to the identification and evaluation of the Initial Set of Alternatives.

P. Law reviewed the timeline and steps for the completion of the AA study that will result in the identification of a single or phased locally preferred transportation strategy that would be recommended to the Metro and OCTA Boards. As the owners of the right-of-way, Metro and OCTA will decide whether and how to move the recommended project forward.

Description of the Alternatives Analysis Process

N. Michali provided a review of the Alternatives Analysis process, and an overview of how the Initial Set of Alternatives were identified based upon an understanding of the corridor's mobility needs and the Purpose and Need of an improved transportation system for the corridor. Different technology or modal options were identified and evaluated on how they addressed the corridor's mobility needs, based on evaluation criteria reflecting stakeholder and community concerns. The six alternatives included in the Initial Set of Alternatives are:

1. Bus Rapid Transit
2. Light Rail Transit
3. Street Car
4. Diesel Multiple Unit/Sprinter
5. Conventional (Steel Wheel) High Speed Rail
6. Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) High Speed Service

N. Michali stated that it was from this set of six Alternatives that the Steering Committee will be asked to select the two Alternatives that should move forward for more detailed analysis to be completed in the Fall 2011.

Questions and Comments

Several Steering Committee members stated that low speed maglev should be added as one of the alternatives to be studied in the Final Screening phase. There was discussion of what information the analysis of low speed maglev should be based on, since there are no maglev systems in revenue operations in the United States. During the committee discussion, issues that were brought up included the following:

- The need for additional funds to cover the costs of adding low speed Maglev, an emerging technology, as a study alternative;
- The dearth of reliable maglev system data, and the fact that the technical and financial data that does exist is likely to be proprietary and/or inaccurate information;
- The possibility that data on different systems (BRT, LRT, Heavy Rail Subway, and Low Speed Maglev) in Nagoya, Japan, where low speed maglev is in operation, could be compiled and extrapolated in order to compare the resulting information in terms of order-of-magnitude capital and operating costs to systems that are operating in Los Angeles County;
- The lack of standards or criteria for identifying and evaluating emerging technologies;
- OCTA's adopted policy of not accepting emerging technologies as viable transportation solutions;
- The uncertainty as to whether FTA would accept an emerging technology as a viable alternative, and the need for consultation with FTA; and
- OLDA could be a resource for some background data as the organization has relationships with the City of Nagoya that might be useful.

Next Steps

The Steering Committee directed SCAG and the project team to develop a scope of work, timeline, and cost to include low speed maglev as an alternative for the Final Screening efforts, and to bring that information back to the Committee at its next meeting on April 27, 2011.